



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
1913

I.—*The Passive Periphrastic in Latin*

BY PROFESSOR R. B. STEELE
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

THE Future Periphrastic Active in Latin is made up of some part of the verb *sum* combined with a form in *-urus*, while in the Passive the combination is with a form in *-ndus*. The latter was originally a present passive, and had this force been maintained the combination would have been a progressive passive and *haec gerenda sunt* would have been equal to *haec geruntur*. But as the regular passive was in common use there was no need for another passive of similar import; the forms in *-ndus* became future, and combined with *sum* were used in the expression of obligation. These were both developed functional uses of the gerundive, and there are some specialized uses which indicate the line along which the development of obligation took place.

By the side of the forms retaining full verbal force there are others which are verbal adjectives giving, not that which is being done, but that which is worthy of being done. A few words, as *praebenda*, go still further and acquire nominal force, but the larger part are characterizing verbals. Of many available illustrations let a few from Vergil suffice: *G.* iv, 3, *admiranda . . . spectacula . . . dicam*; *Aen.* i, 493, *haec dum . . . miranda videntur*; *G.* iv, 283, *memoranda inventa magistri | pandere*; *G.* iii, 294, *veneranda Pales*. In these, as in many other examples of similar import, the forms in *-ndus*

give merely the qualitative aspects of the objects indicating that they are worthy or proper to be considered in a certain way. This adjective force of the verbal is not infrequently found in connection with an adjective, as in Nepos, ix, 5, 2, ea non pia et probanda fuerunt; x, 9, 5, quam invisa sit singularis potentia et miseranda vita; xv, 2, 3, levia et potius contemnenda; Tac. *Ann.* vi, 49, 8, maesta et miseranda; Hor. *Ep.* i, 16, 40, mendosum et medicandum; Juv. vi, 211, bonus optandusque maritus. But if any object or action is worth the while, there is naturally evoked the idea that it ought to be realized, and the idea of obligation is near to that of worth.

We have illustrated the qualitative phases of the forms in *-ndus* by passages in which they are paralleled by adjectives, and the injunctive force can be shown by passages in which there is a contrast with the realized activity expressed by the perfect passive participle: Hor. *Ep.* i, 1, 1, prima dicte mihi, summa dicende Camena; i, 3, 15, monitus multumque monendus; i, 11, 9, oblitusque meorum obliviscendus et illis; *Carm. Saec.* 2, o colendi | semper et culti. There is in these as often no clear line of demarcation between what is "worthy to be" and what "ought to be," but the latter meaning is predominant in the philosophical writings of Cicero, and some passages from his works will do to point out the oughtness expressed by forms in *-ndus*: *de Orat.* i, 221, mala ac molesta et fugienda . . . ; ea quae vulgo expetenda atque optabilia. Of the same import is *de Fin.* iv, 50, iam ille sorites, quo nihil putatis esse vitiosius: quod bonum sit, id esse optabile, quod optabile, id expetendum, quod expetendum, id laudabile, dein reliqui gradus. sed ego in hoc resisto; eodem enim modo tibi nemo dabit, quod expetendum sit, id esse laudabile. And again in *de Legg.* i, 37, sed ut eis, qui omnia recta atque honesta per se expetenda duxerunt et aut nihil omnino in bonis numerandum, nisi quod per se ipsum laudabile esset, aut certe nullum habendum magnum bonum, nisi quod vere laudari sua sponte posset; cf. Sen. *Ep.* 117, 17. As neither *lauda me* nor *laudandus sum* carries *per se* enforcing power, the periphrastic often stops with the expression of what ought to be. But with the ethical injunction there may be given a constraining

influence or power giving, not what ought to be, but what has to be, using the developed meaning of the verb *have*.

The force of the periphrastic reaches from *oportet* to *necesse est*, if we interpret *oportet* and the periphrastic as expressing fitness, but for most of the examples the limits are *debet* and *necesse est*. *Debet facere* and *faciendum est* were at hand for the Roman, and the latter was usually chosen, though it was not admissible in the expression of being, as in Sen. *Ep.* 94, 30, *omnis institutio tollenda est, ipsa natura contenti esse debemus*; in statements in the active : *ib.* 4, 3, (*mors*) *necesse est aut ne perveniat aut transeat*; in contrasting points of time : *ib.* 88, 2, *non discere debemus ista, sed didicisse*; 54, 4, *necesse est et fuisse*.

Some illustrations will be given from Seneca, who may be taken as a fairly representative writer in the expression of ethical values : *Ep.* 94, 26, *scis . . . tibi nil esse debere cum paelice, et non facis. itaque subinde reducendus es ad memoriam. non enim reposita illa esse oportet, sed in promptu.* There seems to be the same intensity in 43, 3, *tibi diligentius vivendum est*; and in 92, 24, *rectius vivat oportet, ut beatius vivat*; as also in 83, 1, *sic certe vivendum est, tamquam in conspectu vivamus.* *Debet* and the periphrastic are contrasted in 6, 1, *nec . . . spero, nihil in me superesse, quod mutandum sit. quidni multa habeam, quae debeant corrigi, quae extenuari, quae attolli?*; as *necesse* and the periphrastic in 98, 10, *tam necesse est perire quam perdere et hoc ipsum si intellegimus, solatum est aequo animo perdere, pereundum est.* A few instances will also be given of the use of *eo*: 82, 22, *ire, comilitones, illo necesse est, unde redire non est necesse; 22, 3, censeo . . . e vita exeundum; 70, 16, nemo nostrum cogitat quandoque sibi ex hoc domicilio exeundum; 93, 2, quid autem interest, quam cito exeas, unde utique exeundum est?* These passages illustrate the equivalence of the different forms of expressing obligation, though the occurrences of *debet*, *oportet* and *necesse est* are few in comparison with those of the periphrastic.

The injunctions of doctors may be held to demand implicit obedience, as in Celsus, cap. 2 (near the end), *post multas*

potationes . . . nihil edendum sit; post satietatem, nihil agendum. Not infrequently there is given the conditional basis for the injunction, as *ib.*, si quibus de causis futura inedia est, labor omnis vitandus est. In dealing with the sick we readily admit the declarations of the doctors that certain things have to be done, if certain results are attained, and their "must be done" is in strong contrast with the philosophical "ought to be done." The latter may be strong enough for the thinker, but the actor often "just has to do things," as was the case with Caesar in the battle of the Nervii, *B. G.* II, 20, 1, Caesari omnia uno tempore erant agenda: vexillum proponendum . . . signum tuba dandum, ab opere revocandi milites, qui processerant, revocandi, acies instruenda, milites cohortandi, signum dandum. There is no doubt that here Caesar had to do certain things, but in general the reader must interpret for himself the injunctive intensity for individual passages.

Both the impersonal *-ndum est* and the personal *-ndus est* forms are used according as the writer wishes to indicate that some action ought to be realized or some object acted upon. By far the larger number of examples in Plautus are in the present *-ndumst*, with occasionally a masculine or feminine form, as in *Bacch.* 65, malacissandus es; *Cas.* 528, attatae, caedendus tu homo's; *Epid.* 74, puppis pereundast probe. Once in a while one of these is in the plural, e.g. *Epid.* 689, conligandae haec sunt tibi hodie; *Trin.* 867, sistendae mihi sunt sycophantiae. Lucretius also freely uses the form *-ndumst* especially at the end of lines. Sallust, Nepos and Varro incline to the use of the impersonal forms, but in the poets, beginning with Terence, and in the prose writers examined, the personal and the impersonal forms do not greatly differ in number, and close together we may find as occasion requires, *cavendum*, *dicendum* or *videndum*, or the object given on which some activity ought to be exerted.

The omission of the proper form of *sum*, considering the entire mass of examples, is not a common feature with either the personal or impersonal forms, yet it is characteristic of Varro's *de Re Rustica*, and we find in I, 37, 4, primo praeparandum, secundo serendum, tertio nutricandum, quarto

legendum, quinto condendum, sexto promendum; followed by *faciendi*, *repastinandum*, *sulcandum*, *arandum*, *fodiendum* and *vertenda*. The omission is also frequent in Quintilian, as in 1, 1, 30, *perdiscendae* . . . *differenda* . . . *credendum*. It is also omitted in many a question, e.g. III, 5, 8, *an uxor ducenda?* *finita*, *an Catoni ducenda?* as also in § 16, but in 13, *Catoni ducenda uxor est?* Other forms of *sum* than the present may also be omitted, as in Tac. *Ann.* II, 20, 7, *quis inpugnandus agger* . . . *conflictabantur*; and also for the maintenance of the present historical view in 1, 65, 25, *struendum vallum*, *petendus agger*, *amissa magna ex parte per quae egeritur humus aut exciditur caespes*. However, as the form of *sum* merely gives the temporal setting for the actions, it is not necessary that this be given with all of a succession of gerundive forms. In the passage already quoted from Caesar, *B.G.* II, 20, 1, *erant* does service for eight gerundives. Another good illustration is Cicero, *de Sen.* 35-36, *resistendum . . . est*, *compensanda sunt*; *pugnandum . . . habenda . . . utendum . . . adhibendum . . . subveniendum est*. Better still is *de Orat.* I, 156-159, where *sum* is used but seven times with twenty-four injunctions laid on the orator.

The contrast in the frequency of *-ndum* and *-ndum esse* is much more marked. *Esse* is regularly omitted in Plautus, though we find in *Capt.* 767, *nunc intelligo | redauspicandum esse* in catenas denuo. The same rule is followed by Terence and Vergil, and for the entire mass examined the statement without *esse* is preferred. Snellman, *De gerundiis orationum Ciceronis*, states (p. 132): “404 gerundia (66 gerundia, 338 gerundiva) ex omnium numero, qui est 593, sine *esse* verbo posita sunt.”

The sphere of the periphrastic is prescriptive or injunctive, and is most freely used by doctors, preachers and teachers. The pages of Celsus fairly swarm with examples. In Cassius Felix and Marcellus these are less noticeable, but when directions are necessary they are given in the impersonal rather than in the personal form, as in Cassius Felix, *de Medicina*, 21, *erit festinandum*; and Marcellus, 5, *cui medendum erit*. Cicero and also Seneca in their philosoph-

ical works are continually presenting to the reader the things that ought to be done; but nowhere else is there such a heaping up of injunctions as in *de Orat.* I, 156–159, and in no other author is the frequency more noticeable than in Quintilian, who is as much interested in the welfare of his pupils as the doctors in the well-being of their patients. Direct narrative has but little use for injunctions, and for this reason poetry taken as a whole furnishes fewer examples than does historical narrative, into which it is often necessary to inject an account of the proceedings of assemblies and the declarations of those in authority. However, the tone for all poetry is not the same, and in Lucretius *fatendumst* and *putandumst* are not infrequently found. Epic poetry has little of the directive element, and the periphrastic is rarely used, as in Verg. *Aen.* v, 710, *quidquid erit, superanda omnis fortuna ferendo est*; and v, 731, *gens . . . debellanda tibi Latio est*. Lyric poetry is similar to the epic, and in the use of the periphrastic the odes of Horace are in strong contrast with his didactic poetry. There is the same contrast between the different works of Ovid. The words in *A.A.* III, 812, “*Naso magister erat*” explain the admonitional character of his amatory poetry; but the *Metamorphoses* is different. The story runs along for 187 verses without any statement of what must be done, when Jupiter breaks in with the words “*perdendum mortale genus . . . ense recidendum est*,” and after that there is only occasionally any use for the periphrastic. The variety of statement in Livy and Tacitus calls for a free use of the construction especially in setting forth the discussion of plans deemed necessary for the success of measures presented. But at any point in the narrative there may be a change in statement from what is to what ought to be, and the periphrastic is the index of such a change.

The larger part of the occurrences of the periphrastic are in the present tense, and when personal are generally directed to a third party. Yet a writer or a speaker sometimes refers to himself, e.g. Cic. *ad Fam.* v, 18, 1, *consolandus ipse sum*; *de Legg.* I, 23, *consociati homines cum dis putandi sumus*; Livy III, 45, 6, *ferro hinc tibi submovendus sum*, Appi?

In comedy one actor sometimes scolds another, as in Plautus *Pseud.* 915, monendu's ne me moneas; *Trin.* 96, tute ipse obiurgandus es. The *Heroides* and *Epistulae* of Ovid have somewhat of a conversational tone, and here and there the periphrastic refers to writer or recipient: *Her.* III, 21, sed data sim, quia danda fui; v, 108, uxor . . . habenda fui; x, 112, aut semel aeterna nocte premenda fui; XII, 116, dila-ceranda fui; *Ep.* xx, 128, exoranda tibi, non capienda fui; *Her.* v, 85, fuerim dissimulanda; III, 39, redimenda fuissem. The imperfect occurs less frequently: *Her.* II, 138, sequendus eram; VIII, 25, eram repetenda. The second person also occurs: *Ep.* xx, 130, petendus eras; xx, 144, legendus eras; and in a condition *Ep.* xv, 159, si reddenda fores, aliquid tamen ante tulissem.

These examples might make it seem that actions are freely presented from the standpoint of the past, yet they are exceptions to the general usage. The past view is unusual for Plautus and Terence though we find in Plautus, *Poen.* 956, eum fecisse aiunt sibi quod faciendum fuit; Terence, *Eun.* 97, sed ita erat res, faciendum fuit; as also in *Heaut.* 400, praeter quam tui carendum quod erat. Of the poets Ovid uses the past most freely, and sometimes one periphrastic pitted against another, as in *Ep.* xx, 128, already quoted, *Met.* v, 415, roganda | non rapienda fuit; and XIII, 193, quae non hortanda sed astu | decipienda fuit. There are comparatively few occurrences in other poets, as in Vergil, *Aen.* xi, 275, haec adeo ex illo mihi iam speranda fuerunt | tempore; and VIII, 565, terna arma movenda | ter leto sternendus erat. Ovid has the imperfect more freely than the perfect, and in this respect he resembles the historians, Seneca and Fronto, while Cicero, Quintilian, and Gellius prefer the perfect.

The pluperfect indicative is an unimportant factor, and the few examples noticed can all be quoted: Cicero, *ad Fam.* I, 9, 17, nunc ab iis, a quibus tuendus fuerat, derelictus; Livy, xxxi, 22, 3, perfectis quae Romae agenda fuerant; xxxv, 37, 2, oratione habita qualis habenda Alexameno fuerat; Seneca, *Ep.* 77, 3, hoc, etiamsi senex essem, fuerat sentiendum; Ovid,

Fasti, v, 610, sic fueras aspicienda Iovi; vi, 254, nec fueras aspicienda viro.

The future setting of the action is not uncommon, but it is not in Plautus and Terence, and is rare in other poetry, though we find in Lucretius, II, 491, si forte voles variare figurās | addendum partis alias erit; and in Horace, *Ep.* II, 1, 41, inter quos referendus erit? The medical writers freely direct their admonitions toward the future, giving the necessary steps in the continued treatment of the patient. Along other lines the larger part are used by Cicero, Seneca, Quintilian, and Ovid, who, in this as in several other respects, resembles the prose writers. The general character of historical narrative precludes a free use of the future, though we have the prospective view of the writers in Livy, xxv, 33, 6, id quidem cavendum semper Romanis ducibus erit, exemplaque haec . . . habenda; Vell. Patrc. I, 3, 2, quod si quis . . . dicet, reddenda erit ei ratio. This view is also sometimes given in speeches: Livy, VII, 40, 13, si dimicandum erit, tum tu in novissimos te recipito; xxx, 30, 22, tunc ea habenda fortuna erit, quam di dederint; xxxix, 16, 4, tum singulis vobis universi timendi erunt; XLV, 24, 12, hic passuri quocumque patiendum erit; Tacitus, *Ann.* II, 38, 13, quod si ambitione exhauserimus, per scelera supplendum erit; Suetonius, *Iul.* 31, quod si ponticulum transierimus, omnia armis agenda erunt.

Rhetorical writers use the present subjunctive most freely; historians, the imperfect, corresponding to their different points of view. Epic poetry with its direct form of presentation does not freely use either tense. In other types of poetry there are a few occurrences of the present in various kinds of clauses, and examples from Plautus will do to illustrate: *Bacch.* 1045, si plus perdundum sit, perisse suavius; *Epid.* 168, quid est quod pudendum siet; *Mil. Gl.* 1358, quom venit in mentem, ut moris mutandi sient; *Poen.* 855, ut enim ubi mihi vapulandum sit, tu corium sufferas; *Stich.* 203, perquirunt . . . uxorin sit reddenda dos divortio. Terence uses it more freely, while Lucretius and Horace have an occasional example. Livy has two-thirds of all the occurrences

in the historians examined, but the high-water mark is reached by Quintilian, who is continually asking in regard to what ought to be done and presenting what he considers are necessary hypotheses.

The chief question of interest in connection with the imperfect subjunctive is the use of *esset* or of *foret*. Caesar, Cicero, Sallust, Nepos, Suetonius, and Seneca use *esset*. Velleius Paterculus and Tacitus have *foret* most freely, while Livy, Curtius, Quintilian, and Gellius prefer *esset*, which Livy has three times as frequently as *foret*. For this Neue,³ III, 186, quotes twenty-four instances, and to these are to be added xxxi, 34, 5, and xxxiv, 27, 6. Here also Ovid is in accord with the majority of the prose writers in preferring *esset*, though other poets generally have *foret*: Plautus, *Mil. Gl.* 170, haud multos homines, si optandum foret, | nunc videre et convenire quam te mavellem; Terence, *Phor.* 207, quid faceres si aliud quid gravius tibi nunc faciendum foret? It is also found in Propertius, I, 10, 19, and 20, and v, 5, 74, while Horace in *Sat.* I, 6, 100 has *foret* with five gerundives. Elsewhere in satire we find in Persius, v, 107, quae sequenda forent, quaeque evitanda vicissim; and in Juvenal, x, 103, ergo quid optandum foret, ignorasse fateris | Seianum; but in vi, 93, quamvis | mutandum totiens esset mare. Lucretius has in III, 836, cadendum . . . esset; while Vergil has in *G.* I, 260, forent . . . properanda; Valerius Flaccus in III, 409, quae danda forent lustramina; and Silius Italicus in IV, 800, an flendae magis Aegates et mersa profundo | Punica regna forent. Elsewhere, xi, 310, he has with adjective force *miranda esset*, and this with *fuisset* is in Lucretius, II, 1037.

With the exception of Ovid, *Her.* III, 39 (si tibi ab Atride pretio redimenda fuisse | quae dare debueras), the pluperfect subjunctive seems limited to Cicero and Livy, the larger part of the instances in conditions, as in Cicero, *ad Att.* I, 20, 2, quod si . . . mihi faciendum fuisse, nullam rem tanti aestimassem; *ad Fam.* VI, 12, 2; *de Orat.* I, 62; *pro Murena*, 34; *de Domo*, 132; *pro Sestio*, 44; *in Pisonem*, 19; *pro Plancio*, 43; and in Livy, xxii, 32, 3, ut nisi cum fugae specie abeundum ei fuisse, Galliam repetiturus fuerit; and

in v, 56, 3, etiamsi tum migrandum fuisse, nunc . . . non censerem. There are fewer occurrences with the periphrastic in the apodosis: Cicero, *in Verrem*, II, 1, 157, nisi pro-vidisses, tibi ipsi tum pereundum fuisse; *ib.* v, 5; *in Cat.* III, 17; *de Orat.* II, 196, si dolor afuisse meus, non modo non miserabilis, sed etiam irridenda fuisse oratio mea; *ad Quint.* *Frat.* III, 4, 2, sic enim faciendum fuisse. A condition is implied in Livy, XLIV, 7, 7, quid intercluso ab Thessalia patiendum fuisse; and with causal instead of conditional statement in XLIV, 27, 6, ipsis quoque Romanis de se cogitandum fuisse, quando neque manere . . . potuissent.

The perfect subjunctive lies almost entirely outside of the range of poetry, though we find in Ovid, *Her.* v, 84, fuerim dissimulanda. The prose occurrences are more numerous than those of the pluperfect, including not only conditional statements, but also other kinds of clauses and indirect questions. The occurrences in conditions are relatively few in Cicero: *ad Att.* v, 4, 2, est enim ita, ut, si . . . futurus sit, minus urguendi fuerint; *ad Brut.* II, 5, 2, itaque res in eum locum venerat, ut, nisi Caesari Octaviano deus quidam illam mentem dedisset, in potestatem . . . M. Antoni veniendum fuerit. Livy has a few more occurrences: VIII, 32, 5, si ego tacitus abissem . . . dirigenda tua sententia fuerit; X, 27, 11; III, 39, 5, quae si in rege . . . ferenda non fuerint, quem laturum in tot privatis? V, 53, 3, vos, etiamsi tunc faciendum non fuerit, nunc utique faciendum putatis. There are a few other occurrences in Seneca and Quintilian, but the larger part are not in conditional statements.

The perfect occurs most freely in indirect questions, some varieties of which will be illustrated; Cicero, *de Off.* III, 9, adhibendumne fuerit hoc genus . . . an plane omittendum? *de Orat.* II, 177, quid proponendum fuerit declarare; *de Domo*, 31; *ad Att.* III, 23, 2, sed, quae cavenda fuerint et quo modo, te non fugit; *in Verrem*, V, 75, vide, quid intersit, utrum faciendum fuerit; Livy, VIII, 32, 4, interrogo . . . utrum mihi . . . res publica in discrimen committenda fuerit, an auspicia repetenda? XXXIII, 40, 2, inquirere, quid regi Antiocho faciendum aut quoisque terra marique progredien-

dum fuerit; Vell. Paterc. II, 122, 2, idem illi honor et defendendus et recipiendus fuerit? Seneca, *Ep.* 14, 13, disputare an illo tempore capessenda fuerit sapienti res publica; Quint. III, 8, 20-21, dedendine fuerint . . . an penetrandum in Germaniam fuerit? Cicero has some examples in consecutive clauses, as also Livy in III, 53, 6, adeo aqua postulastis, ut ulro vobis deferenda fuerint. The occurrences in *cum*-clauses seem limited to Livy, VI, 14, 12, cum conferendum . . . aurum fuerit; XLV, 42, 9; Curtius, VI, 10, 6; and Quintilian, VII, 10, 6, cum fuerit prima quaestione dicendum. A *quin*-clause associated with a condition is found in Livy, XXI, 34, 7, haud dubium fecit, quin, nisi firmata extrema agminis fuissent, ingens in eo saltu accipienda fuerit; and also with *dubito* in Cicero, *Claent.* 48, quis est qui dubitet, quin . . . aut obeunda mors Cluentio aut suscipienda accusatio fuerit? There are also a few occurrences in relative clauses: Livy, X, 19, 1, ne collegae auxilium, quod acciendum ulro fuerit . . . sperneret; XLII, 40, 4; XLII, 52, 13, omnia quae deorum indulgentia, quae regia cura praeparanda fuerint, plena cumulataque habere Macedonas; and in a causal clause indirectly stated, Livy, VII, 9, 4, quia . . . eundum pravae cupiditati fuerit.

Fuisse is found in every Teubner volume of Cicero, some two score occurrences in all. The occurrences in conditions, as of the perfect subjunctive, are comparatively few, e.g. *pro Archia*, 4, perficiam profecto ut . . . non segregandum, cum sit civis . . . verum etiam, si non esset, putatis ascendum fuisse; *pro Milone*, 52, huic, si insidiaretur, noctem prope urbem expectandam, illi, etiamsi hunc non timeret, tamen accessum ad urbem nocturnum fuisse metendum. It also occurs in Tacitus, *Ann.* II, 63, 11; and XI, 36, 5, nec cuiquam ante pereendum fuisse, si Silius rerum poteretur. There are some occurrences in Quintilian (VII, 4, 19; IX, 4, 32; XI, 1, 83), but it is most noticeable in Livy and in his follower Curtius, about one-half of the examples in conditions, as in Livy, VII, 4, 6, quod naturae damnum utrum nutriendum patri, si quidquam in eo humani esset, an castigandum ac vexatione insigne faciendum fuisse?— and in

Curtius, vi, 8, 13, dimittendum fuisse Cebalinum, si delationem eius damnabat.

The occurrences of *fore* in the periphrastic seem limited to a few instances in Cicero, Livy and Curtius. Cicero has it in *ad Brut.* II, 3, 6, *ut tibi persuadeas non fore illi abutendum gloria tua*; *ad Fam.* III, 13, 1, *quasi divinarem tali in officio fore mihi aliquando expetendum studium tuum*; and with adjective force in *de Orat.* I, 74, *non possum dicere eum non egregium quendam hominem atque admirandum fore*. Livy uses it most freely: v, 30, 1, *ut qui meminisset sibi pro aris . . . dimicandum fore*; XXXI, 11, 17, *postulandum fore*; XXXII, 20, 6, *fore defendendum*; XXXVI, 27, 7, *mittendos fore legatos*; XXXVII, 39, 2, *habendos milites fore*; XLII, 46, 3, *omni ope enitendum fore Rhodiis*; Curtius, III, 8, 19, *laetus . . . in illis potissimum angustiis decernendum fore*; IV, 5, 5, *senescendum fore tantum terrarum vel sine proelio obeunti*.

The person particularly interested in the action expressed by the periphrastic is given in the dative (dative of agent), as in Caes. *B.G.* II, 20, 1, *Caesari omnia . . . agenda erant*; Sen. *E.p.* 3, 2, *diu cogita, an tibi in amicitiam aliquis recipiendus sit*; 3, 6, *et quiescenti agendum et agenti quiescendum est*; 36, 4, *iuvandi parandum, seni utendum est*. But considering the entire number of occurrences of the periphrastic the dative is used in comparatively few instances, for the larger part of the actions are of interest to all, and it is not necessary to mention any one, as in Sen. *E.p.* 33, 6, *sumenda erunt, non colligenda*; 63, 1, *lacrimandum est, non plorandum*; 72, 3, *resistendum est occupationibus nec explicandae, sed submovendae sunt*. This limitation in the use of the dative of agent renders it of little interest, and the same may be said of the syntactical features of the periphrastic itself.

Most of the occurrences are independent injunctions, and in subordinate relations the conditions are the most noticeable. Though the action given in the apodosis necessarily accompanies that of the protasis, the use of the periphrastic in the former sometimes makes assurance doubly sure, as in Sen. *E.p.* 4, 3, (*mors*) *timenda erat, si tecum esse posset*; 51, 13, *quae*

si aliter extrahi nequirent, cor ipsum cum illis revellendum erat; 76, 26, quod non erat faciendum, si esset ullum aliud bonum quam honestum. These examples illustrate the use of the indicative in unreal conditions, the force inhering in the periphrastic rendering the use of the subjunctive unnecessary. Logical conditions, however, are most freely used, e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 21, 7-8, si vis Pythoclea divitem facere, non pecuniae adiciendum, sed cupiditati detrahendum est . . . si vis P. honestum facere, non honoribus adiciendum est, sed cupiditatibus detrahendum. si vis P. esse in perpetua voluptate non voluptatibus adiciendum est, sed cupiditatibus detrahendum. si vis P. senem facere et implere vitam, non annis adiciendum, sed cupiditatibus detrahendum. The periphrastic is used as freely in the protasis. When so used the apodosis may give what must be, as in Sen. *Ep.* 30, 17, si timenda mors, semper timenda est; but more commonly what is, as in 17, 3, si navigandum est, non strepunt portus nec inquieta sunt litora; what has been, 28, 7, non multum prodest vitia sua proiecisse, si cum alienis rixandum est; or what will be, 22, 8, dicentur tibi ista . . . si nihil indignum bono viro faciendum patiendumve erit. Taken as a whole, whatever interest there may be in the periphrastic is due not to this or that syntactical point, but to the frequency of occurrence of the injunctive tone in the different types of literature.